

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-36, 39-44, and 47-66 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-29, 31, 32, 35, 39, 40, 47-52, 54, 55 and 58 have been amended as shown on pp. 3-11 of the Reply. In addition, new claims 59-66 have been added as shown on pp. 11-13 of the Reply.

Favorable consideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claims 29 and 47

Claims 29 and 47 stand objected to because of informalities in the claim language. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Claims 29 and 47 have been amended to overcome the informalities associated with this objection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn in view of the amendments.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-32, 41-44, and 58 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-32, 41-44, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 6,259,782) and further in view of Robbins et al. (US 2004/0072593 A1). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all recited features of the claims.

An aspect of applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system for providing a single telephone number for use with a plurality of handsets in one or more networks. In particular, independent claim 1 recites: "[a] system for providing a single telephone number for use with a digital cordless handset and with a second handset, the system comprising: a wireless access point . . . having a means for communicating with the digital cordless handset . . .; and a **media gateway** having . . . means for enabling the **wireless access point** to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset, wherein a call directed toward the second handset is received at the media gateway, and the **telecommunications network** generates a ring tone at the second handset . . . wherein the digital cordless handset and the second handset are

assigned the single telephone number” (emphasis added). Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest such features.

Rather, Gallant provides for a network 100 communicatively coupled to a public switch telephone network (PSTN), and including a wireline terminal 102 and a wireless terminal 110 communicatively coupled to a data signaling network 160. The wireline terminal 102 and the wireless terminal 110 are communicatively coupled to the data signaling network 160 via a wireline switch 120 and a wireless switch 130, respectively. The wireline terminal 102 and the wireless terminal 110 are associated with and accessible by a single, permanent telephone number. However, as admitted on page 12 of the Office Action, Gallant fails to disclose or suggest the feature recited as “*a media gateway*” (emphasis added), and therefore necessarily fails to disclose or suggest the features recited as: “*a media gateway having . . . means for enabling the **wireless access point** to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset, wherein a call directed toward the second handset is received at the media gateway, and the **telecommunications network** generates a ring tone at the second handset . . . wherein the digital cordless handset and the second handset are assigned the single telephone number*” (emphasis added). Robbins *et al.* fails to cure this deficiency.

Robbins *et al.* discloses a network having a soft switch 134 including a media gateway controller 164. The soft switch 134 is configured to access a contact list and rules for call processing determined by a user, and route incoming calls to a desk phone 136 or an associated dual mode subscriber device 130 based on the contact list and the rules. In some embodiments, instead of a soft switch 134 including a media gateway controller 164, the network includes a soft switch 334 communicatively coupled to a gateway 340. Nonetheless, based on the disclosure, the functionality of the soft switch 134 is applicable to the soft switch 334 in that the soft switch 134, 334 is the feature configured to route incoming calls to a desk phone 136 or an associated dual mode subscriber device 130.

In various embodiments, the desk phone 136 and the dual mode subscriber device 130 may be in the different networks. For example, the desk phone 136 may be associated with a local area network (LAN) 138 and the dual mode subscriber device 130 may be associated with a wireless local area network (WLAN) 132 or a cellular network. Notwithstanding such, Robbins *et al.* teaches that the **single** soft switch 134 generates

rings at **both** the desk phone 136 **and** the dual mode subscriber device 130 from its central location. To this extent, Robbins *et al.* expressly states that “the soft switch 134 rings the desk phone 136 for all incoming calls regardless of whether it rings the dual mode subscriber device 130.” Accordingly, Robbins *et al.* teaches a **single component, not multiple components**, for generating rings at communication devices communicatively coupled to one or more networks, in particular, and **centralized, not distributed** control of the generation of rings, in general. Therefore, for at least this reason, Robbins *et al.* does not disclose or suggest the above-recited features of claim 1: “[a] system for providing a single telephone number for use with a digital cordless handset and with a second handset, the system comprising: a wireless access point . . . having a means for communicating with the digital cordless handset . . .; and a **media gateway** having . . . means for enabling the **wireless access point** to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset, wherein a call directed toward the second handset is received at the media gateway, and the **telecommunications network** generates a ring tone at the second handset . . . wherein the digital cordless handset and the second handset are assigned the single telephone number” (emphasis added).

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 (or claims 3-7, 30-32, 41, 42 and 58, which depend therefrom), and thus fail to render obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, for this reason alone, applicants’ representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 also recites the joint features: “**a media gateway having: means for interfacing with a data switch**, the data switch including programming means to respond to routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to route data packets to at least one of the digital cordless handset or the second handset” (emphasis added) and “**a media gateway having: . . . means for enabling the wireless access point to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset . . . and the telecommunications network generates a ring tone at the second handset . . .**” (emphasis added). Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest such features.

For at least the reasons provided above with reference to claim 1, the Gallant fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 1. Robbins *et al.* does not cure these deficiencies.

As discussed above, Robbins *et al.* teaches a network that includes a soft switch 334 communicatively coupled to a gateway 340. The gateway 340 is configured to provide an interface between the soft switch 334 and a mobile switching center (MSC) 140. The dual mode subscriber device 130 may be communicatively coupled to the MSC 140. As discussed above, the soft switch 334 is configured to access a contact list and rules for call processing, and route incoming calls to a desk phone 136 or the dual mode subscriber device 130 based on the contents of the contact list and the rules. Because, the gateway 340 may interface with the soft switch 334, Robbins *et al.* may disclose the feature recited in the claim: “***a media gateway having: means for interfacing with a data switch, the data switch including programming means to respond to routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to route data packets to at least one of the digital cordless handset or the second handset***” (emphasis added), although applicants’ representative makes no such admission. Nonetheless, even assuming arguendo that Robbins *et al.* discloses such feature, Robbins *et al.* teaches that **the soft switch 334, not the gateway 340**, is the feature of the network that **generates rings** at both the desk phone 136 and the dual mode subscriber device 130. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Robbins *et al.* does not disclose or suggest the above-recited features of claim 1: “***a media gateway having . . . means for enabling the wireless access point to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset . . . and the telecommunications network generates a ring tone at the second handset***” (emphasis added).

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 (or claims 3-7, 30-32, 41, 42 and 58, which depend therefrom), and thus fail to render obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, for this reason also, applicants’ representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 3 recites: “[t]he system of claim 1, wherein the ring tone at the digital cordless handset, and the ring tone generated at the second handset are **generated substantially simultaneously**” (emphasis added). Claim 3 depends from and therefore

incorporates all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 necessarily incorporates the following features: “***a media gateway having . . . means for enabling the wireless access point to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset . . . and the telecommunications network generates a ring tone at the second handset . . .***” (emphasis added). Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* disclose or suggest the features of claims 1 or 3.

As discussed above with reference to claim 1, and as admitted on page 12 of the Office Action, Gallant fails to disclose the feature recited as “a media gateway” and the above feature recited as: “***a media gateway having . . . means for enabling the wireless access point to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset . . . and the telecommunications network generates a ring tone at the second handset . . .***” (emphasis added). Because Gallant does not disclose or suggest the above features regarding the “media gateway,” it necessarily does not disclose or suggest the features that elaborate on the “media gateway” in claim 3. Specifically, because Gallant discloses no “media gateway,” it discloses none of the functionality or operation of the “media gateway” as recited in claim 3. Accordingly, contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, for at least this reason alone, Gallant does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 3: “[t]he system of claim 1, wherein the ring tone at the digital cordless handset, and the ring tone generated at the second handset are ***generated substantially simultaneously***” (emphasis added). Robbins *et al.* fails to cure this deficiency.

As discussed above, Robbins *et al.* discloses a network having a soft switch 134 including a media gateway controller 164. The soft switch 134 is configured to access a user-defined contact list and rules for call processing, and route incoming calls to a desk phone 136 or an associated dual mode subscriber device 130 based on the contact list and the rules. Robbins *et al.* discloses that the rules can be based on factors such as the identity of the originating caller, the time and/or day of the call and/or whether the user is currently using the desk phone 136 or the dual mode subscriber device 130. Further, Robbins *et al.* discloses that, based on the rules, the soft switch 134 can determine whether to route a call to one or both of the desk phone 136 or the dual mode subscriber device 130. While Robbins *et al.* also states that, based on the call processing, “the soft swing 134 rings the desk phone 136 for all incoming calls regardless of whether it rings the dual mode subscriber device,” Robbins *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest the concurrency and/or timing of

the rings. Specifically, the features recited by claim 3: “*wherein the ring tone at the digital cordless handset, and the ring tone generated at the second handset are **generated substantially simultaneously***” (emphasis added) are not disclosed or suggested.

Further, and to the contrary, throughout the disclosure of Robbins *et al.*, the reference recognizes that call processing in a cellular network, through which the soft switch 134 may ring the dual mode subscriber device 130, must be expedited due to the nature of the delay in such systems. For example, Robbins *et al.* discloses that while the dual mode subscriber 130 is in a cellular footprint, processing for the dual mode subscriber device 130 should be expedited so that “delay associated with . . . a cellular voice call are masked and the response of the system is much faster as perceived by the human user.” Accordingly, by extension, one of ordinary skill in the art reading Robbins *et al.* would understand Robbins *et al.* to suggest that processing to the dual mode subscriber device 130 should be initiated prior to the processing to the desk phone 136, in some cases. Therefore, not only does Robbins *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 3: “*wherein the ring tone at the digital cordless handset, and the ring tone generated at the second handset are **generated substantially simultaneously***” (emphasis added), it likely teaches away from such features.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 3, and thus fail to render obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, applicants’ representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

New claim 59 recites: “[t]he system of claim 1, wherein the ring tone at the digital cordless handset and the ring tone at the second handset are each generated **based on an assignment of the digital cordless handset and the second handset to the single telephone number, and independent of a user-defined call processing rule, priority or category associated with the digital cordless handset or the second handset**” (emphasis added).

Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed disclose or suggest the features of claim 59.

Gallant does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 59 because claim 59 depends from, and therefore necessarily incorporates, each of the features of claim 1. Further, Gallant teaches a system that is contrary to the recited features. Specifically, Gallant teaches that a calling priority scheme 190 is assigned to the permanent telephone number 180 in order to determine the sequential order in which to route a call to the wireline terminal 102 and the

wireless terminal 110. The calling priority scheme 190 “designate[s] which of the subscriber’s terminals to call when a request for call completion is made to the telephone number.” Because Gallant teaches routing a call based on user-defined call processing rules or priorities, Gallant, even in combination with Robbins *et al.*, does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 59.

Robbins *et al.* does not cure this deficiency. Robbins *et al.* also teaches user entry or selection of rules for processing incoming calls. The rules determine whether the soft switch 134 routes the incoming call to the dual mode subscriber device 130, the desk phone 136 or both. Because Robbins *et al.* teaches routing a call based on user-defined call processing rules or priorities, it does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 59. For at least this reason, Robbins *et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of Gallant. Mohammed also does not cure these deficiencies.

Mohammed merely discloses a system 10 including a base station 18 configured to provide an unregulated wireless connection to a subscriber device 12. Accordingly, Mohammed fails to cure the deficiencies of Gallant and Robbins *et al.*

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 59, and thus fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject claim.

Independent claims 8 and 27 recite features similar to those of independent claim 1. In particular, claim 8 recites: “[a] method for providing a single telephone number for use with a plurality of handsets, the method comprising: . . . enabling a **media gateway** to: . . . enable one of the one or more **wireless access** points to generate a ring tone at the first handset, and **the second telecommunications network** to generate a ring tone at the second handset. . .” (emphasis added). Claim 8 also recites the joint features: “[a] method for providing a single telephone number for use with a plurality of handsets, the method comprising: . . . enabling a **media gateway** to: . . . **interface with a data switch** for routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to at least one of the first handset and or the second handset” (emphasis added) and “[a] method for providing a single telephone number for use with a plurality of handsets, the method comprising: . . . enabling a **media gateway** to: . . . enable one of the one or more **wireless access** points to generate a ring tone at the first handset, and **the second telecommunications network** to generate a ring tone at the second handset. . .” (emphasis added).

Independent claim 27 recites: “[a] system for providing a single telephone number for use with a digital cordless handset and with a second handset, the system comprising: . . . means for enabling a media gateway to: . . . enable **the wireless access point to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset, and the telecommunications network to generate a ring tone at the second handset . . .**” (emphasis added). Claim 27 also recites the joint features: “[a] system for providing a single telephone number for use with a digital cordless handset and with a second handset, the system comprising: . . . means for enabling a **media gateway to: . . . interface with a data switch** for routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to at least one of the digital cordless handset or the second handset” (emphasis added) and “[a] system for providing a single telephone number for use with a digital cordless handset and with a second handset, the system comprising: . . . means for enabling a **media gateway to: . . . enable the wireless access point to generate a ring tone at the digital cordless handset, and the telecommunications network to generate a ring tone at the second handset . . .**” (emphasis added). For at least one or more of the reasons provided for claim 1, neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all features of claims 8 or 27.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion for claim 1, for similar reasons, applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 8 (or claims 9-11, 13-17, 43-44 and 28-, which depend therefrom) or claim 27 (or claims 28 and 29, which depend therefrom), and thus fail to render obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, applicants’ representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 33-36 and 39-40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 33-36 and 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 6,259,782) and further in view of Robbins *et al.* (US 2004/0072593 A1) as applied to claims 1, 8, and 27, and further in view of Mohammed (US 6,922,559). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all recited features of the claims.

Aspects of Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a systems and methods for providing a single telephone number for use with a plurality of handsets in one or more networks, wherein one of the networks includes an unregulated wireless connection. In particular, claim 33 recites: “[t]he system of claim 1, wherein the wireless connection comprises an **unregulated** wireless connection” (emphasis added). For at least one or more of the reasons provided above for claim 1, neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 33. Mohammed does not cure this deficiency.

Mohammed merely discloses a system 10 including a base station 18 configured to provide an unregulated wireless connection to a subscriber device 12. Accordingly, Mohammed fails to cure the deficiencies of Gallant and Robbins *et al.*

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, and in view of the dependency of the subject claims from claims 1, 8 or 27, applicants' representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of the subject claims, and thus fail to render them obvious. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 47-55 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 47-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robbins *et al.* (US 2004/0072593 A1) and further in view of Gallant (US 6,259,782). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all recited features of the claims.

An aspect of applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a media gateway for providing a single telephone number for use with a plurality of handsets in one or more networks. In particular, independent claim 47 recites: “[a] **media gateway comprising: means for enabling a wireless access point to generate a ring tone at a digital cordless handset; . . . means for linking a telecommunications network to a wired data network configured to provide voice and data services, the telecommunications network generating a ring tone at the second handset. . .**” (emphasis added). Claim 47 also recites the joint features: “[a] **media gateway comprising: . . . means for interfacing with a data switch for routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to at least one of the digital cordless handset or a second**

handset . . .” (emphasis added), and “[a] **media gateway comprising: means for enabling a wireless access point to generate a ring tone at a digital cordless handset; . . . means for linking a telecommunications network to a wired data network configured to provide voice and data services, the telecommunications network generating a ring tone at the second handset. . .**” (emphasis added). For similar reasons to at least one or more of the reasons provided for claim 1, neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 47.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 47 (or claims 48-55, which depend therefrom), and thus fail to render obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, applicants’ representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 56 and 57 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 56 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robbins *et al.* (US 2004/0072593 A1) and Gallant (US 6,259,782) as applied to claim 47, and further in view of Mohammed (US 6,922,559). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all recited features of the claims.

An aspect of applicants’ claimed subject matter relates to a media gateway for providing a single telephone number for use with a plurality of handsets in one or more networks, wherein one of the networks includes an unregulated wireless connection. In particular, claim 56 recites: “[t]he **media gateway of claim 47, wherein the wireless connection comprises an *unregulated wireless connection***” (emphasis added). For at least one or more of the reasons provided for claim 47, neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 56. Mohammed does not cure this deficiency.

Mohammed merely discloses a system 10 including a base station 18 configured to provide an unregulated wireless connection to a subscriber device 12. Accordingly, Mohammed fails to cure the deficiencies of Gallant and Robbins *et al.* as discussed above with reference to claim 47, from which the subject, rejected claims depend.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, and in view of the dependency of claim 56 from claim 47, applicants' representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 56 (or claim 57, which depends therefrom), and thus fail to render obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

VI. New Claims 60-66

An aspect of applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system for providing communication with a plurality of communication devices. In particular, claim 60 recites: “[a] *system for providing communication with a plurality of communication devices, the system comprising: a first communication terminal communicatively coupled to a first network and adapted to communicate with a first one of the plurality of communication devices; a second communication terminal communicatively coupled to a second network and adapted to communicate with a second one of the plurality of communication devices, the first one of the plurality of communication devices and the second one of the plurality of communication devices being assigned to a single telephone number; a media gateway configured to be communicatively coupled to the first network and the second network; and a data switch communicatively coupled to the media gateway and being configured to receive routing information indicative of an incoming communication intended for the single telephone number and route information associated with the incoming communication to the first one of the plurality of communication devices and the second one of the plurality of communication devices, the information associated with the incoming communication being routed based on the assignment of the first one and the second one of the plurality of communication devices to the single telephone number, independent of a user-defined call processing rule, priority or category associated with the first one or the second one of the plurality of communication devices*” (emphasis added). For at least the reasons provided above for claim 59, neither Gallant

nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 60.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants' representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 60, and thus fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject claim.

As noted above, an aspect of applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system for providing communication with a plurality of communication devices. In particular, new claim 61 recites: "[t]he system of claim 60, wherein the information associated with the incoming communication is indicative of information for generating a ring tone at the first one and the second one of the plurality of communication devices." New claim 62 recites: "[t]he system of claim 60, wherein the information associated with the incoming communication is routed to the first one and the second one of the communication devices substantially simultaneously." New claim 63 recites: "wherein the first communication terminal is a wireless access point communicatively coupled to a data network." New claim 64 recites: "[t]he system of claim 60, wherein the first network is an unregulated wireless network." For at least the reasons provided above for claim 60, from which claims 61-65 depend, neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features recited in the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants' representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claims 61-65, and thus fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject claims.

An aspect of applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system for providing communication with a plurality in a network. In particular, new claim 65 recites: "***a plurality of communication devices in the network, each of the plurality of communication devices being adapted to be associated with a plurality of selectable telephone numbers, wherein each of the plurality of selectable telephone numbers is associated with one of a plurality of call processing services; a first communication terminal communicatively coupled to the network and to each of the plurality of communication devices; a media gateway communicatively coupled to the network; and a data switch communicatively coupled to the media gateway and configured to receive routing information corresponding to a selected one of the plurality of***

selectable telephone number and, based on the selected one of the plurality of selectable telephone numbers, process an outgoing communication to receive an associated one of the plurality of call processing services” (emphasis added).

As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Gallant merely discloses a wireline terminal 102 and a wireless terminal 110, each associated with a **single**, permanent telephone number that is **not disclosed or suggested to be selectable** by the user. Gallant also merely discloses call processing based on a **call priority scheme 190** that associates call processing based on the time of day or other factors independent of a telephone number with which the wireline terminal 102 and the wireless terminal 110 are assigned. For these reasons alone, Gallant does not disclose or suggest features of the recited claim. Robbins *et al.* does not cure this deficiency.

Robbins *et al.* also merely discloses an incoming call routed to either the dual mode subscriber device 130 or the desk phone 136 based on user-defined entries and selections that are **wholly independent of a telephone number** with which the dual mode subscriber device 130 and the desk phone 136 are associated. Further, Robbins *et al.* discloses only that “each dual mode subscriber 130 is associated with a specific desk phone 136.” Accordingly, Robbins *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest whether the dual mode subscriber device 130 or the desk phone 136 are associated with a plurality of selectable telephone numbers, and whether call processing services are based on any selectable telephone numbers. For these reasons alone, Robbins *et al.* does not cure the deficiencies associated with Gallant. Mohammed *et al.* also does not cure these deficiencies.

Mohammed merely discloses a system 10 including a base station 18 configured to provide an unregulated wireless connection to a subscriber device 12. Accordingly, Mohammed fails to cure the deficiencies of Gallant and Robbins *et al.*

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 65, and thus fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject claim.

As noted above, an aspect of applicants’ claimed subject matter relates to a system for providing communication with a plurality in a network. In particular, new claim 66 recites: “[t]he system of claim 65, wherein one or more of the plurality of call processing services may be dynamically associated with one or more of the plurality of selectable telephone numbers.”

For at least the reasons provided above for claim 65, from which claim 66 depends, neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features recited in the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing discussion, applicants' representative respectfully submits that neither Gallant nor Robbins *et al.* nor Mohammed, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 66, and thus fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject claim.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Deidra D. Ritcherson/

Deidra D. Ritcherson

Reg. No. 55,574

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731